

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4311

Minute Man memorial building. This magnificent undertaking assumes a broader significance because it is to be built with your members' contributions, given voluntarily, by those who understand this vital military tradition and its value to posterity.

In a democratic republic, the people need to be continually reminded of the value of their freedoms, and of their obligations to serve this freedom. R.O.A. members justly take pride in the fact that, as true volunteers in what must be our eternal vigilance, you again are leading the way to establishment of a great and living national shrine for a vital national commitment through the historic military tradition of the United States.

I am deeply concerned with the trend of derogation of the military. As in any group, there are dangerous men and bad actors among the military. But as in most groups, they are very much in the minority. I have had my personal experiences with some of them. I know how ruthless they can be. I know how they can conduct campaigns of vilification—how they can make pious denials before congressional committees—and a few years later, after it is too late, how the commentator-columnists to whom they have fed their vilification and prodded to echo that vilification, belatedly realize and confess privately that they have been used and then apologize to those who have been vilified.

I know that there are militarists who dangerously advocate reckless warfare. I know that there have been militarists who defy law and order. I know that there are militarists who charge our Presidents with being traitors, selling our country out to the Communists.

I know that there are these dangers and evils among some militarists—but they are very, very rare indeed—and seldom do such irresponsible militarists rise to any position of any great authority. They are so rare that never has militarism presented a danger of dictatorship to our country or even the slightest risk of a military takeover and the usurpation of our traditional civilian control of the military.

I know that there is a strong military-industrial complex—the kind that President Eisenhower warned against in his closing days as President. I know that we have to guard against that complex getting too strong in its pressures on both the executive branch and the legislative branch of our Federal Government.

But I also know that the military-industrial complex has not reached proportions beyond the control of the public—and especially an aroused public opinion expressing itself at the polls. I know that this military-industrial complex will never control the executive branch or the legislative branch regardless of how many retired generals and admirals work for defense contractors—and regardless of how many Members of Congress are in the Reserve.

It has become quite the vogue of some to have two favorite whipping boys—the military and the Congress. These detractors are by no means limited to the press. They are to be found not too infrequently in the Pentagon among the smart young men who have never experienced war responsibilities.

Some of these smart young men have come to regard and treat admirals and generals as though they are errand boys to be seen but not heard. The higher the rank the more the delight in the derogation and humiliation that is heaped upon the very men who led the forces that saved our country in wartime, while some of their smart young detractors were growing up back in the safe confines of this country that bombs did not touch—or even before some of these smart young detractors were ever born.

Now Congress has long been the traditional whipping boy—but in the acquisition of a companion whipping boy in the military—

a very juicy and special target has been gained—the citizen-soldier in the Congress. I won't belabor a defense of the reservists in the Congress for they are fully capable of taking care of themselves. And if they can't take care of themselves—if they are improperly in the Reserve—if they are taking undue and unethical advantage of being in the Reserve—then the electorate will take care of them at the polls.

What does disturb me is the broader picture of the trend of derogation of the Reserve—of the citizen-soldier—the minute-man, if you please. It is somewhat like the days prior to World War II when many people ridiculed reservists on 2 weeks training duty as playing war, when contemporaries of active and conscientious reservists laughed at the reservists and derided them.

I shudder to think what would have happened to our country had the pre-World War II reservists been so fainthearted and so thinskinned that such derogation would have caused them to leave the Reserve. Thank God, they had the fortitude and patience to stick to their Reserve guns and not give in.

I shudder to think what our country would have done without our Reserves to call up in the Berlin crisis—for history's first use of the Reserves for cold war purposes—for a show of force and determination to get the message loud and clear to Khrushchev. I am certain that he would never have backed down on his Berlin threat and it not been for the callup of our Reserves.

I shudder to think what our country would have done without our Reserves in the Cuban crisis and the nuclear confrontation in which Khrushchev backed down. For example, what would our Air Forces have done without the magnificently immediate response of the Air Force Reserve?

Yes, the detractors of the Reserve—those who say there is no need for a Reserve—those who would make errand boys out of our top military men—can attack the military and the Reserve all they want to—but I don't think the American people can be fooled as to the importance of our military Reserve.

Yet, we must face up to facts and to realism. As the years go by after a war and after a threat to our national security, there is the tendency of those who have not known war or who have had made so little sacrifice in war or been so little inconvenienced by war, if at all—to forget the need of the military and the Reserve—or to regard them as an unnecessary cost in time of peace and to be ridiculed.

Therein is a mission for your organization and for each of your members individually. Therein is a minuteman mission for each of you—to protect your country's national security through constant education and reminder of the civilian population of the importance of military strength, and particularly that strength embodied in the Reserve.

We must always maintain civilian control of the military. We must always fight against military arrogance—and no one knows more about military arrogance than I do—and I don't believe that anyone has fought and stood up to military arrogance more than I have.

But equally we must fight against civilian arrogance that seeks to so cynically derogate and humiliate military leaders who not only have risked their lives for their country but whose intelligence and judgment is at least the equal of those arrogant smart young men, who derogate them, and whose experience is far superior to these young men.

For if we do not fight such civilian arrogance as much as military arrogance, then so surely our military leadership and establishment will degenerate into that of second-class "yes men" who never have a thought of their own—or if they do, don't dare speak it for fear of repercussions—just as was the case in the fear-paralyzed U.S. Senate in the early fifties.

No one has more caustically crossed swords with the military than I have—and no one has felt the whiplash of the retaliation of the military more than I have. But in that open controversy with the military, I have gained—rather than lost—respect for our military leaders in uniform—at least for those who speak their minds themselves and openly instead of hiding behind the cloak of commentator-columnists—and I gladly rise to their defense, not so much for them personally, as for their crucial importance to the national security of our country.

God bless them.

NEW YORK TIMES CRITICIZES APPOINTMENT OF OIL LOBBYIST DICKERSON TO TOP OIL LOBBY POSITION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times has won an enviable reputation for integrity. It is always at the top of every list of great American newspapers. Its editorials are responsible and careful.

So when the New York Times speaks its concern over the appointment of an oil lobbyist to a top oil policymaking position in the Interior Department that editorial deserves thoughtful consideration.

But the Times has done more than this, in light of the Dickerson appointment it calls in today's editorial for the President of the United States to reverse his policy decision delegating authority over the oil industry to the White House, as the Times puts it:

One way to protect the national interest and to make sure that the oil lobby does not unduly influence oil policy is to keep complete authority in the White House.

Mr. President, in view of the growing concern over the implications of the appointment of oil lobbyist Joe Dickerson as head of the Office of Oil and Gas, I once again call on the President and Secretary Udall to reconsider this tragic appointment and to replace Mr. Dickerson.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from today's New York Times entitled "Making Oil Policy" be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAKING OIL POLICY

When President Johnson decided to transfer authority over national oil policy from the White House to the Interior Department, we questioned the wisdom of the move. Understandably, the President wanted to keep the powerful oil lobby at arm's length. But oil policy is too important to be left to any single department, which might find it much more difficult than the White House to resist the oil lobby's pressures.

Joe T. Dickerson has now been appointed to head Interior's Office of Oil and Gas, the bureau mainly responsible for setting oil policy. There is no question about Mr. Dickerson's qualifications as an oil expert. He has been engaged in the oil business since 1923. Since 1960 he has been executive vice president of Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, an exceedingly active element in the oil lobby. Mr. Dickerson himself has been a registered lobbyist, and was recommended for his post with the Interior Department by the National Petroleum Council, a group composed entirely of oil company executives.

Lobbying is a legitimate and honorable occupation. But, as Senator WILLIAM PROX-

MIRE has pointed out, it is doubtful that anyone who has lobbied so effectively and for so long can "act as an impartial, objective referee between the oil industry and the consumer." Noting that Mr. Dickerson's superior, John Kelly, Assistant Secretary in Charge of Minerals, is a lifelong oil producer who still possess large holdings, Mr. PROX-MIRE argues that consumer interests have no effective voice.

Mr. PROX-MIRE wants the President to reconsider the appointment of Mr. Dickerson. In view of Mr. Johnson's desire to protect the consumer, he ought to reconsider his decision to give up immediate control over oil policy. The President is ultimately responsible for whatever decisions are made on oil. One way to protect the national interest and to make sure that the oil lobby does not unduly influence oil policy is to keep complete authority in the White House.

PHILIPS BEE SUPPORTS QUALITY STABILIZATION

Mr. PROX-MIRE. Mr. President, one of the finest small cities in Wisconsin is Philips, located in the beautiful north-central part of our State. Many times in the past 10 years I have walked through this beautiful town, talking with every proprietor and customer in each place of business. The Philips Bee is the town newspaper and it is a high quality production in every respect.

A visit to the shop of the Philips Bee is a visit to a small business operation that is well equipped, efficiently organized and obviously making a success in one of the toughest and most competitive fields in the world: printing.

All this is background for my calling the attention of the Senate to an excellent column carried in the Philips Bee on February 13 supporting the Quality Stabilization bill. The Philips Bee itself as a small business understands the serious problems of survival in small business these days. Because of its very close day-to-day association with local retail businesses in Philips it knows what serious difficulties small business is in and how vital quality stabilization is to its very life.

I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Washington Letter" from the February 13 issue of the Philips Bee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philips (Wis.) Bee, Feb. 13, 1964]
WASHINGTON LETTER: QUALITY IS NO BARGAIN
(By Robert Nelson Taylor)

The discounters are out to kill the quality stabilization bill, designed by congressional sponsors to protect the quality of products by the American housewife.

They charge that the sponsors—leaders of both political parties—desire only to impede "progress" of the giant merchandisers, in the face of their own boasts that they will "take over lock, stock, and barrel, by 1970, 80 percent of the retail business in the country."

Every housewife knows that price alone is no indication of value. She knows too that manufacturers of national brand merchandise spend millions on research and advertising to develop her continuing loyalty. But first they must build quality into their products because they know that she pre-

fers slightly higher priced quality merchandise to shoddy goods.

The unethical mass merchant literally steals the good reputation of national brand products by using them as loss leaders to build up store traffic. But he does not tell the housewife that he makes up these losses by overcharging on hundreds of unknown products.

Purpose of the discounter is to drive small merchants out of business to control a market area so that he can dictate the wholesale prices at which he will continue to handle a manufacturer's products. If the manufacturer complies, this usually means a sacrifice in quality.

Quality stabilization protects quality by giving the manufacturer the option to refuse the use of his good name and reputation in unethical and deceptive advertising and to permit him to establish a fair retail price on products bearing his trademark.

So it is easy to see why discounters oppose this measure. They are not interested in quality, but price alone—to bait the American housewife with "cheap" merchandise.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, at this time of emphasis on economy in Government it is well to examine closely all serious suggestions for reducing Federal expenditures.

The Government Economy Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers has studied the President's budget and has made a number of detailed recommendations for savings, recommendations which deserve careful consideration.

In the interest of calling attention to these recommendations I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary of the committee's report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT ECONOMY COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1965, ADOPTED BY THE NAM BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEBRUARY 12, 1964

It is gratifying that the President has submitted a budget estimating actual spending in fiscal year 1965 slightly below the estimate for fiscal year 1964, but it is disturbing that the requested new authority to spend, if granted, would result in a significant increase in spending totals after 1965.

Substantial reductions in the levels of both the authority to spend, and the projected spending in many separate activities in fiscal year 1965, are necessary in order to:

1. Compensate for the tax reduction now in the final stages of enactment.
2. Prevent a buildup in spending in fiscal years after 1965.
3. Assure final spending in fiscal year 1965 below the President's estimate.

These reductions could and should be achieved by:

1. Stringent congressional screening of Executive requests for new obligational authority, reducing the spending authority granted in a maximum number of line items in each appropriation bill.

2. Congressional refusal to enact proposed legislation or expand existing legislation which would increase Federal participation in areas of State, local, or private function and responsibility.

3. Executive and congressional action to curtail the scope and improve the management of continuing activities.

The NAM Government Economy Committee's study of the Federal budget for 1965 on a line-by-line basis suggests reductions of \$6.6 billion in nondefense areas from the Executive request for \$103.2 billion in new spending authority. If realized these reductions in spending authority would result in a drop of \$3.9 billion from the \$97.9 billion of estimated expenditures in fiscal 1965.

The results of the Government Economy Committee study, as summarized in the following table, are endorsed as a step toward greater economies to be achieved by congressional screening of all line items in the budget.

[Dollars in millions]

Appropriation bill	Number of line items	Suggestions on the 1965 budget	
		Cut in spending authority	Effect on spending
Agriculture:			
REA	1	\$428.0	\$383.0
Other	17	448.1	380.0
Subtotal		876.1	763.0
Foreign aid	9	746.4	560.0
Independent offices:			
Housing and Home Finance	9	125.8	115.5
Space	1	455.5	545.0
Veterans Administration	5	83.8	44.0
Other	6	209.3	76.2
Subtotal		874.4	780.7
Interior	7	63.8	24.3
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare:			
Labor	6	296.0	206.9
Education	9	1,360.9	273.9
Public Health Service	20	479.7	90.4
Welfare	7	315.5	299.2
Other	5	29.4	19.3
Subtotal		2,481.5	868.7
Military construction	1	73.6	67.1
Public works	9	117.6	95.8
Treasury-Post Office:			
Treasury	1	45.4	28.9
Post Office	1	29.3	29.3
Subtotal		74.7	58.2
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:			
State	4	17.2	19.1
Commerce	7	220.5	52.6
Subtotal		237.7	71.7
Special allowances:			
Poverty	1	500.0	250.0
Contingencies	1	500.0	300.0
Subtotal		1,000.0	550.0
Total	127	6,536.8	3,869.5

THE THORNY PROBLEM OF VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in recent weeks Walter Lippmann has brought his great intelligence to bear on that thorniest of problems, Vietnam. In several excellent articles he has shown that there may be alternatives to the current dilemma of defeat and withdrawal or expansion of the war into a Korea-size conflict or worse. His ideas are provocative and realistic, and I ask unanimous consent that his most recent column, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of those Senators who may have missed it.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4313

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1964]
 CONCERNING VIETNAM
 (By Walter Lippmann)

The Vietnamese war poses the difficult question of whether it can be discussed responsibly in public. For any discussion of the problem of the war is an admission that there is a problem, and this carries with it some doubt about the success of a military solution by the methods we are now employing. To admit that there is any doubt at all might, there is reason to fear, trigger the collapse of the very fragile fighting morale of the South Vietnamese Government and people. I think this may well be true and that the officials who keep wishing that Senator MANSFIELD would be silent and that the press would not talk about the matter are not beset by imaginary fears.

Yet this poses a grave question for public men and for the responsible press. Should they hide from our people this undeclared quasi-war, which has been waged surreptitiously, and can lead either to a defeat or to a full-scale war of incalculable consequences?

It would not be necessary to discuss the Vietnamese war seriously if the choice before us were, on the one hand, to keep on doing what we are doing in South Vietnam—if necessary for 25 years—or, on the other hand, to win the war in South Vietnam by attacking North Vietnam. For myself, I do not believe that this is the real choice which confronts us. It is, I believe, supremely improbable that Americans will be able to fight a 25-year war on the mainland of Asia; it is, I am convinced by the specialists I have talked to, most improbable that what is essentially a civil war in the south can be stopped by bombing cities in the north.

The nearer and the actual danger is that the government in Saigon will be overturned, as it has been twice in the past few months. It might be overturned by a junta which will call for the end of the war, the neutralization of South Vietnam, and the departure of the Americans. Something very like this has already happened on a small scale in Cambodia, an adjoining part of what used to be Indochina. Such a neutralization of South Vietnam would indeed be a defeat for the United States, and it is in order to prevent such a defeat that General de Gaulle's intervention in southeast Asia is relevant.

General de Gaulle is not proposing the neutralization of South Vietnam. He is proposing the neutralization of what used to be French Indochina and, if possible, the whole of southeast Asia—of North and South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and perhaps Thailand and Burma as well. This general neutralization would be under international guarantees given by Red China, the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, India, and the United States.

Quite obviously, such a political solution would be very difficult to work out, and it may well be that it is now too late to attempt it because the situation in the south has been deteriorating so rapidly. I am, nevertheless, in favor of trying for it or, more exactly, of letting General de Gaulle try for it. For unless Secretary McNamara comes back from South Vietnam persuaded that a military solution is possible, the alternative to trying for the general neutralization of the whole region may be collapse and defeat in Saigon.

At present our position in Vietnam is like that of a man on a bicycle who must keep going in order not to fall down. I think we must and should keep going. We must not and we cannot withdraw. We must try to avoid the defeat which the neutralization of South Vietnam alone would mean. What we should do, I believe, is to make plans and dispositions for the continuing presence of American power in this area in order that if and when general neutraliza-

tion is proposed, we shall have significant bargaining power.

Though a general neutralization of the area would certainly be difficult to bring about, it is not inconceivable and it is not altogether impossible. Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam has no desire to be ruled by the Chinese. Access to the food grown in the south would be tempting to him. The reduction of the risk and threat of a great war between China and the United States would be a benefit to him. As for Red China itself, there is always the problem of the long disputed and dangerous frontier with the Soviet Union in the north, and a bargain which tranquilized the borderlands on the south might therefore be attractive.

I am not forgetting that it is easier to fall than to succeed. But the future would be brighter if some kind of political solution could be brought about.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT, ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has submitted its fifth annual report to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Members will recall that this Commission was established by Congress in 1959 for the following basic purposes:

First, to bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for consideration of common problems;

Second, to provide a forum for discussion of the administration of Federal grant programs;

Third, to give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs;

Fourth, to make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the Federal system;

Fifth, to encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation;

Sixth, to recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of government; and

Seventh, to recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

The Commission is composed of representatives of the public and of each level of government. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and I have served on the Commission since its establishment. On the House side, Representative FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and the original sponsor of the bill creating the Commission, and

the Congresswoman from New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, are also charter members. The other House Member is Representative KROGH, of New York.

In addition to the six Members from Congress, the Commission has three members from the executive branch: the Secretary of the Treasury, the HEW Secretary, and the HHFA Administrator. Other members include four Governors, four mayors, three State legislative leaders, and three elected county officials. The public is represented by three members, one of whom is the Commission's Chairman.

A year has elapsed since the submission of the Commission's fourth annual report, and it is appropriate that the Senate be informed of the Commission's activities during the past 12 months. Other Members of Congress have joined me in the past in calling attention to specific Commission reports, and I am sure they will do so in the future.

At the outset I should again like to pay tribute to the distinguished Chairman under which the Commission has proceeded, Mr. Frank Bane, of Virginia, a man known to many of you for his lifetime career of constructive work and leadership in the Federal, State, and local governments. President Eisenhower first appointed him as Chairman of the Commission; President Kennedy reappointed him for a second term in 1962. Mr. William G. Colman, the Commission's executive director, ably supervises the professional staff which as of December 31, 1963, numbered 24.

Serving on the Commission has been a stimulating and rewarding experience for me. I frankly enjoy discussing and debating major questions of Federal-State-local relations. I may not always agree with the majority view on particular subjects, but I never have left a Commission meeting without new insights concerning present-day intergovernmental relations.

During the past 12-month period general meetings of the Advisory Commission were held in March, June, and September 1963, and this year in January. The following major reports requiring implementation were adopted during the course of these sessions:

First, "Transferability of Public Employee Retirement Credits Among Units of Government"—A-16, March 1963.

Second, "The Role of States in Strengthening the Property Tax"—A-17, June 1963, two volumes.

Third, "Industrial Development Bond Financing"—A-18, June 1963. A very important study on the role of equalization in Federal grants was given preliminary consideration at the September meeting and adopted last month.

Last year the Commission published another in its series of studies which are primarily of an informational nature, not requiring legislative or executive implementation. This technical study, entitled "Performance of Urban Functions: Local or Area-wide"—A-21, September 1963—was designed to encourage a fresh look at urban services by those concerned with the fragmentation and inefficiency of municipal functions in metropolitan areas. This analysis,

along with its predecessors, has been made available in order to provide much needed reference material to State and local governments.

All of the Advisory Commission's reports have been widely distributed. Federal, State, and local legislative and administrative officials, as well as professional, business, and academic leaders, have given them considerable attention. Two ACIR studies were reprinted last year in order to meet the continuing demand. An additional four are now out of print but summaries are available for two of these.

You will be interested in what has occurred as a result of these reports and other activities. Since it is a continuing national body, the Commission is not satisfied with merely drafting studies and making recommendations. Its members are anxious to see their recommendations put into effect and have devoted a significant share of their energies to stimulating and encouraging the adoption of its recommendations at the pertinent levels of Government. Six problem areas at the national level were emphasized last year:

First. In the report, "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas," the view was expressed that Federal grants to metropolitan planning agencies under section 701 of the Housing Act, as amended, would be more effective if provided on a continuing rather than a project basis. The Housing and Home Finance Agency subsequently determined that continuity and financial support of the kind recommended by the Commission could be provided under existing legislation. As a result, the Urban Renewal Administration issued a directive on August 23, 1963, authorizing use of section 701 funds by metropolitan and regional planning agencies on a continuing as well as a project basis.

Second. In the same report, the Commission suggested that the coordination of Federal programs providing financial assistance for physical facilities within metropolitan areas be improved. It recommended that applications for certain Federal grants-in-aid be reviewed and commented upon by an areawide planning agency prior to final consideration by the Federal agency concerned. Bills implementing this recommendation were introduced in the 2d session of the 87th Congress—S. 3363 and H.R. 11799—but no action was taken. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress I reintroduced the measure—S. 855—and Representative FLORENCE DWYER and Representative ALBERT RAINS introduced companion measures in the House—H.R. 1910 and H.R. 2168, respectively. The Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations held hearings on S. 855 last May. After six executive sessions the subcommittee reported an amended bill to the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which approved the bill for floor action. It passed the Senate on the 23d of last month.

Third. To carry out the recommendations made in the Commission's report entitled "Coordination of State and Federal Inheritance, Estate, and Gift Taxes,"

the following bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress: H.R. 5039, KEOGH; H.R. 6206, FOUNTAIN; and H.R. 6207, DWYER. These bills are still pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Fourth. To implement the Commission's recommendation for increased flexibility at the State level in the handling of certain public health grants and to provide for uniform apportionment and matching formula for such grants, the following bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress: H.R. 2487, DWYER; H.R. 6195, FOUNTAIN; and S. 1051, MUSKIE. Cosponsors of my bill include Senators BARTLETT, ERVIN, McCARTHY, McGEE, MOSS, MUNDT, NELSON, PEARSON, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, TOWER, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. These bills are pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Fifth. In 1961 the Commission adopted a report dealing with State and local taxation of privately owned property located on Federal areas, and recommended that Federal agencies be authorized to retrocede existing Federal legislative jurisdiction to State governments with respect to various lands and properties. It also endorsed a legislative proposal along these lines which had been developed earlier by the Senate Government Operations Committee staff with the cooperation of the Justice Department in order to implement recommendations outlined in the 1956-57 report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States. Legislation to carry out this proposal was introduced by Senator McCLELLAN—S. 815—last February at the request of the Attorney General of the United States. Identical bills were introduced in the House—H.R. 4068, SCHWENGLER, and H.R. 4433, DAWSON.

Hearings on S. 815 were held last August by my subcommittee, and the measure is now being considered in executive sessions.

Sixth. In 1962 a Commission report on intergovernmental responsibilities for water supply and sewage disposal in metropolitan areas recommended that the Federal Water Pollution and Control Act be amended (a) to increase the ceiling for sewage treatment grants for a single project from \$600,000 to \$1 million; (b) to authorize a ceiling of \$4 million instead of \$2,400,000 for combined sewage treatment projects serving several communities; and (c) to authorize a 10-percent Federal financial incentive for those treatment works consistent with a comprehensive areawide plan for urban development. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress I introduced S. 649 to carry out these and other objectives. Cosponsors are Senators BAYH, CLARK, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, FONG, GRUENING, HART, HUMPHREY, INOUYE, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, McCARTHY, McGEE, MOSS, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PELL, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YOUNG of Ohio. Representative BLATNIK introduced a companion measure in the House—H.R. 3166. My bill

includes a number of other legislative proposals dealing with Federal enforcement power, additional grants, and organization matters on which the Commission took no position. The bill passed the Senate in October 1963; hearings on the House bill have now been completed by the House Public Works Committee.

In the same 1962 report, the Commission advised amending the public facility loan program so as: (a) to remove population ceilings and permit joint action by communities in meeting water and sewer needs, (b) to tighten eligibility requirements for use of wells and septic tanks under the FHA mortgage insurance program, and (c) to provide insurance for site preparation and development costs of water and sewerlines and systems. Representative DWYER's H.R. 9080 implements this proposal.

The Commission also recommended that the President direct the appropriate Federal departments and agencies to evaluate present enforcement powers and financial incentives to control industrial pollution in order to determine how their effectiveness may be improved through changes in procedures, policy, or statutory revision, and the roles of State and local governments in such programs. In response to this recommendation, the Public Health Service contracted with the Institute of Public Administration to evaluate possible measures for providing financial and other appropriate incentives to encourage industrial population abatement. It is expected that this report will be completed in the near future.

The Advisory Commission has been as concerned with the implementation of their State and local recommendations as with their Federal. A wide variety of recommendations for State legislative action were distributed to State and local officials during 1962 and 1963. These proposals, designed to improve State, local, and interlocal relations, were distributed in the form of draft bills. Most of these bills have met with the approval of the Committee of State Officials on Suggested Legislation, of the Council of State Governments, and have been included in the Annual Programs of Suggested State Legislation submitted by the council to the Governors and State legislatures. The year 1963 witnessed enactment by the States of many measures which incorporated substantially all or a significant part of the draft language proposed by the Advisory Commission. These measures covered six recommendations: First, the grant of permissive authority for interlocal cooperation and other local government action to meet local problems, particularly those in metropolitan areas; second, imposition of stricter standards for municipal incorporation; third, establishment of a State office of local affairs; fourth, investment of idle cash balances; fifth, State government action to acquire or preserve "open space"; and sixth, State financial and technical assistance to urban areas for mass transportation.

The full story of State legislative accomplishments in these areas was set forth in an address which I recently placed in the RECORD. I wish to again